

REMARKS

In the action of November 12, 2010, the examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph; rejected claim 7 and 9 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph; rejected claim 12 under 35 USC § 102 as anticipated by Lamond et al.; and rejected claims 1, 6, 7 and 9-12 under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Driesen. The examiner further indicated that claims 2-5 and 8 contain allowable subject matter.

In response, please note that applicant has amended claim 1 and cancelled claim 7, in addressing the examiner's rejections under 35 USC § 112. Withdrawal of those rejections is respectfully requested.

In response to the rejection over prior art, claim 1 has been amended to include limitations substantially similar (although not identical) to original claim 2. Claim 1 is believed to define over the reference to Driesen. Accordingly, allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitations of original claims 4 and 5, which are not present in Driesen. Driesen discloses no disengaging member in a housing for the brushhead assembly. In order to disengage the axial direction locking mechanism, radial pressure must be applied to the brush tube 3 or brushhead holder 11 (paragraph 61, line 5-7). Accordingly, amended claim 10 is allowable.

Claim 12 is cancelled.

Since claims 3-6 and 8-9 are dependent upon claim 1, those claims are also allowable, as is claim 11 which is dependent upon claim 10.

In view of the above, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

JENSEN & PUNTIGAM, P.S.

By Clark A. Puntigam
Clark A. Puntigam, #25763
Attorney for Applicant